

**Flow cytometry for fast screening and automated risk assessment in systemic light-chain amyloidosis**

**Running title:** Flow cytometry for AL amyloidosis

**Authors:** Noemi Puig <sup>1\*</sup>, Bruno Paiva <sup>2\*</sup>, Marta Lasa <sup>2</sup>, Leire Burgos <sup>2</sup>, Jose J. Perez <sup>1</sup>, Juana Merino <sup>2</sup>, Cristina Moreno <sup>2</sup>, Maria-Belen Vidriales <sup>1</sup>, Dolores Gómez Toboso <sup>1</sup>, Maria-Teresa Cedena <sup>3</sup>, Enrique M. Ocio <sup>1</sup>, Ramon Lecumberri <sup>2</sup>, Alfonso García de Coca <sup>4</sup>, Jorge Labrador <sup>5</sup>, Maria-Esther Gonzalez <sup>6</sup>, Luis Palomera <sup>7</sup>, Mercedes Gironella <sup>8</sup>, Valentin Cabañas <sup>9</sup>, Maria Casanova <sup>10</sup>, Albert Oriol <sup>11</sup>, Isabel Krsnik <sup>12</sup>, Albert Pérez-Montaña <sup>13</sup>, Javier de la Rubia <sup>14</sup>, Jose-Enrique de la Puerta <sup>15</sup>, Felipe de Arriba <sup>16</sup>, Felipe Prosper <sup>2</sup>, Joaquin Martinez-Lopez <sup>3</sup>, Quentin Lecrevisse <sup>17</sup>, Javier Verde <sup>18</sup>, Maria-Victoria Mateos <sup>2</sup>, Juan-Jose Lahuerta <sup>3</sup>, Alberto Orfao <sup>17</sup> Jesús F. San Miguel <sup>2</sup>

**Author Affiliations:** (1) Hospital Universitario de Salamanca, Instituto de Investigacion Biomedica de Salamanca (IBSAL), Centro de Investigación del Cancer (IBMCC-USAL, CSIC), Salamanca; (2) Clinica Universidad de Navarra, Centro de Investigacion Medica Aplicada (CIMA), IDISNA, CIBERONC Pamplona; (3) Hospital 12 de Octubre, Madrid, CNIO, Universidad Complutense CIBERONC; (4) Hospital Clínico Universitario de Valladolid, Valladolid; (5) Hospital Universitario de Burgos, Burgos; (6) Hospital de Cabueñes, Gijon; (7) Hospital Clinico Universitario Lozano Blesa, Zaragoza; (8) Hospital Universitari Vall d'Hebron, Barcelona; (9) Hospital Clínico Universitario Virgen de la Arrixaca, Murcia; (10) Hospital Costa del Sol, Marbella; (11) Institut Català d'Oncologia i Institut Josep Carreras, Hospital Germans Trias i Pujol, Badalona; (12) Hospital Puerta de Hierro, Madrid; (13) Hospital Son Espases, Palma; (14) Hospital Doctor Peset, Valencia; (15) Hospital de Galdakao, Vizcaya, (16) Hospital Universitario Morales Meseguer. IMIB-Arrixaca; (17) Servicio General de Citometría, Universidad de

Salamanca, IBSAL, and IBMCC CSIC-USAL, CIBERONC, Salamanca; (18) Cytognos  
SL, Salamanca. Spain.

\* These authors contributed equally to this work.

**Address for correspondence:**

Bruno Paiva, Ph.D

Clinica Universidad de Navarra; Centro de Investigacion Médica Aplicada (CIMA)

Av. Pio XII 55, 31008 Pamplona, Spain

e-mail: [bpaiva@unav.es](mailto:bpaiva@unav.es)

## ABSTRACT

Early diagnosis and risk stratification are key to improve outcomes in light-chain (AL) amyloidosis. Here, we used multidimensional-flow-cytometry (MFC) to characterize bone marrow (BM) plasma cells (PCs) from a series of 166 patients including newly-diagnosed AL amyloidosis (N=94), MGUS (N=20) and multiple myeloma (MM, N=52) vs. healthy adults (N=30). MFC detected clonality in virtually all AL amyloidosis (99%) patients. Furthermore, we developed an automated risk-stratification system based on BMPCs features, with independent prognostic impact on progression-free and overall survival of AL amyloidosis patients (hazard ratio:  $\geq 2.9$ ;  $P \leq .03$ ). Simultaneous assessment of the clonal PCs immunophenotypic protein expression profile and the BM cellular composition, mapped AL amyloidosis in the crossroad between MGUS and MM; however, lack of homogenously-positive CD56 expression, reduction of B-cell precursors and a predominantly-clonal PC compartment in the absence of an MM-like tumor PC expansion, emerged as hallmarks of AL amyloidosis (ROC-AUC=0.74;  $P < .001$ ), and might potentially be used as biomarkers for the identification of MGUS and MM patients, who are candidates for monitoring pre-symptomatic organ damage related to AL amyloidosis. Altogether, this study addressed the need for consensus on how to use flow cytometry in AL amyloidosis, and proposes a standardized MFC-based automated risk classification ready for implementation in clinical practice.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

2           Systemic amyloidosis is caused by misfolding and extracellular deposition of  
3 circulating proteins as amyloid fibrils leading to progressive organ damage. Thus,  
4 targeting the earlier steps of the amyloid pathogenic process would facilitate the  
5 highest therapeutic efficacy by preventing the propagation of abnormal protein folding  
6 and its aggregation that precede tissue deposition and organ damage.(1) Light chain  
7 (AL) amyloidosis is the most common form of systemic amyloidosis, which is caused by  
8 a small plasma cell (PC) clone that produces misfolded light-chains that might target  
9 virtually every organ except the brain.(2)

10           Survival of patients with AL amyloidosis depends on the extent of organ  
11 involvement (mainly cardiac damage), response to treatment and the PC  
12 burden/biology.(1) Cardiac involvement is the leading cause of death, and early  
13 diagnosis is critical to anticipate irreversible end-organ damage.(3) Thus, biomarkers  
14 that help identifying patients with (both intact immunoglobulin and light-chain)  
15 monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS) or multiple myeloma  
16 (MM) at greater risk of developing AL amyloidosis, are highly valuable to monitor pre-  
17 symptomatic organ damage (e.g. NT-proBNP and albuminuria for cardiac and renal  
18 involvement, respectively).(4,5) Unfortunately, no tumor clone feature or phenotype has  
19 been identified so far that could anticipate this risk; in fact, the low incidence of AL  
20 amyloidosis and its low tumor burden, often masked by a polyclonal PC background,  
21 account for limited information on the tumor PC biology, particularly when compared to  
22 MM.(6)

23           Final diagnosis of AL amyloidosis typically relies on histology and it is often  
24 difficult to achieve. Because of the small size of the PC clone in AL amyloidosis,  
25 identification of the M-component requires at least immunofixation of both serum and  
26 urine, plus serum free light-chain (sFLC) measurements. Of note, around 15% of  
27 patients with AL amyloidosis present with significant organ involvement but a normal  
28 sFLC ratio, and additional tests are required in these patients for the identification of

1 the amyloidogenic PC clone.(7) Thus, new high-sensitive tools for the detection of very  
2 small clones have been proposed, such as mass spectrometry (8,9) and next-  
3 generation flow (NGF) cytometry.(10)(11) In recent years, flow cytometry  
4 immunophenotyping has proven to be a valuable technique in the differential diagnosis  
5 of some monoclonal gammopathies (12,13) and to predict outcome in MM, based on  
6 the extent of PC clonality in the BM.(14,15) Sporadic studies based on small patient  
7 series and/or earlier generations of the technique have pointed out the potential clinical  
8 utility of flow cytometry in AL amyloidosis (16,17), but no consensus exists on how to  
9 use and interpret flow cytometry results in these settings.(11)

10 Here, we used multidimensional flow cytometry (MFC) and the EuroFlow NGF  
11 antibody panel to characterize a large series of patients with newly-diagnosed AL  
12 amyloidosis vs MGUS and MM, as well as age-matched healthy adults. Our results  
13 support the use of flow cytometry-based automated risk-stratification in AL amyloidosis,  
14 mapped the disease in the crossroad between MGUS and myeloma, and identified  
15 immunophenotypic markers significantly associated with AL amyloidosis that could  
16 potentially be used as red-flags for monitoring of pre-symptomatic organ damage in  
17 MGUS and MM patients at risk of developing an associated AL amyloidosis.

## SUBJECTS AND METHODS

**Patients.** A total of 94 patients with confirmed new diagnosis of AL amyloidosis based on the presence of amyloid-related systemic syndrome, positive amyloid tissue staining with Congo red, restricted LC deposition, and evidence of PC clonality, were studied with a median follow-up of 15 months (range: 1-40 months). The number of events for progression and for death were 14 and 30, respectively. Nine of the 94 cases were diagnosed with AL amyloidosis plus MM based on the presence of  $\geq 20\%$  BMPCs by cytomorphology. Patients' demographics and clinical characteristics are described in Table 1. Organ involvement was defined according to the updated consensus criteria for amyloid-related organ involvement (18,19). In parallel, 30 healthy adults of similar age, 20 MGUS and 52 newly-diagnosed MM patients were also included in the study for comparison with AL amyloidosis. Overall, a total of 196 bone marrow (BM) samples were collected after informed consent was given, in accordance with the local ethics committee guidelines and the Declaration of Helsinki.

**Tumor PC immunophenotyping.** NGF-based antibody combinations were used for the characterization of BM samples of healthy adults, and for baseline assessment of clonality in patients with MGUS, as well as newly-diagnosed AL amyloidosis and MM.(10) Briefly, the EuroFlow lyse-wash-and-stain standard sample preparation protocol (adjusted to  $10^6$  nucleated cells in MGUS, AL amyloidosis and MM) together with the optimized 2-tube 8-color EuroFlow NGF antibody panel, for accurate identification of BM PCs and discrimination between phenotypically aberrant and normal PCs -tube 1: CD138-BV421, CD27-BV510, CD38-FITC, CD56-PE, CD45-PerCPCy5.5, CD19-PECy7, CD117-APC, CD81-APCH7; and, tube 2: CD138-BV421, CD27-BV510, CD38-FITC, CD56-PE, CD45-PerCPCy5.5, CD19-PECy7, cyKAPPA-APC, cyLAMBDA-APCH7-, were used. The two-tube strategy allows detection of clonality with specific confirmation of light-chain restriction on phenotypically aberrant PCs, identified either by antigen under-expression (CD19, CD27, CD38, CD45, CD81)

and/or antigen over-expression (CD56, CD117, CD138). Tube 2 was not stained in BM samples from patients with newly-diagnosed MM due to the high-level infiltration by clonal PCs. In a subset of patients with AL amyloidosis (N = 38) and in all cases with MM (N = 52), additional staining for the following five 8-color monoclonal antibody combinations (BV421, BV510, FITC, PE, PerCPCy5.5, PECy7, APC, APCH7) were performed: 1) CD138, CD24, CD38, SLAMF7, CD45, CD19, CD229, CD20; 2) CD138, CD9, CD38, CD21, CD45, CD19, CD63, CD10; 3) CD138, HLADR, CD38, CD53, CD45, CD19, CD200, CD268; 4) CD138, CD49d, CD38, CD74, CD45, CD19, CD274, CD69; 5) CD138, CD196, CD38, CD184, CD45, CD19, CD31, CD43. Data acquisition was performed in a FACSCanto II flow cytometer (BD Biosciences, San Jose, CA) using the FACSDiva 6.1 software (BD). Data analysis was performed using the Infinicyt software (Cytognos SL, Salamanca, Spain).

**Profiling of the BM cellular composition.** The first 8-color antibody combination of the NGF panel described above was used for enumeration of CD38<sup>-</sup> (CD117<sup>+</sup>, CD38<sup>-</sup>, CD45<sup>+</sup>, SSC<sup>lo</sup>), CD38<sup>+</sup> (CD117<sup>+</sup>, CD38<sup>+</sup>, CD45<sup>+</sup>, SSC<sup>lo</sup>), erythroid (CD117<sup>+</sup>, CD38<sup>-dim</sup>, CD45<sup>-dim</sup>, SSC<sup>lo</sup>) and myeloid (CD117<sup>+</sup>, CD38<sup>+</sup>, CD45<sup>dim</sup>, SSC<sup>hi</sup>) hematopoietic progenitors, basophils (CD38<sup>+</sup>, CD81<sup>-</sup>, CD45<sup>dim</sup>), eosinophils (CD45<sup>bright</sup>, CD81<sup>bright</sup>, SSC<sup>hi</sup>), monocytes (CD45<sup>+</sup>, CD38<sup>+</sup>, CD81<sup>+</sup>, SSC<sup>int</sup>), mast cells (CD117<sup>bright</sup>, CD45<sup>dim</sup>), neutrophils (CD45<sup>dim</sup>, CD81<sup>-</sup>, SSC<sup>hi</sup>), erythroblasts (CD45<sup>-</sup>, CD38<sup>-</sup>, SSC<sup>lo</sup>), TNK- plus NK-cells (CD45<sup>+</sup>, CD56<sup>+</sup>, CD19<sup>-</sup>, SSC<sup>lo</sup>) and other remaining non-T/NK T-lymphocytes (CD45<sup>+</sup>, CD56<sup>-</sup>, CD19<sup>-</sup>, SSC<sup>lo</sup>), as well as B-cells and their subsets of B-cell precursors (CD19<sup>+</sup>, CD45<sup>dim</sup>, CD38<sup>bright</sup>, CD27<sup>-</sup>), naïve (CD19<sup>+</sup>, CD45<sup>+</sup>, CD38<sup>-dim</sup>, CD27<sup>-</sup>) and memory (CD19<sup>+</sup>, CD45<sup>+</sup>, CD38<sup>-dim</sup>, CD27<sup>+</sup>) B-lymphocytes; such data were used to generate individual patient' BM immune profiles for each case analyzed (N = 196 BM samples).

## **Automated immunophenotypic characterization of patients with AL**

**amyloidosis.** Automated immunophenotyping for patient's classification and prediction of outcome was performed by comparing the percentage of BM PCs plus the relative percentage of clonal and normal PCs within the whole BM PC compartment for each patient with AL amyloidosis vs a database previously developed that contained information on the same three parameters from a total of 1,774 patients, including 497 MGUS and 1,227 newly-diagnosed MM enrolled in the GEM2000 (N = 486) plus GEM2005MENOS65 (N = 330) protocols for transplant-eligible cases, and the GEM2005MENOS65 (N=239) plus GEM2010MAS65 (N=222) protocols for transplant-ineligible patients.(15) Using EuroFlow software tools, principal component analysis (PCA) based on those three parameters was performed and graphically displayed via the automatic population separator (APS; PCA1 vs. PCA2) representation of Infinicyt. Based on the APS view defined through direct comparison of MGUS and symptomatic MM patients, two clear cut groups of patients defined by 1.5 standard deviation borders emerged, corresponding to MGUS and MM cases, respectively; each AL amyloidosis patient was then represented by a dot in such bi-dimensional (PC1 vs PC2) APS representation of the patient profiles. Finally, each patient with AL amyloidosis plotted against the dataset, was classified as MGUS-like, intermediate or MM-like. In parallel, automated discrimination of AL amyloidosis patients displaying different immunophenotypic protein expression profiles (iPEP) of clonal PCs was performed using the t-Distributed Stochastic Neighbor Embedding (t-SNE) projection available in the Infinicyt software. Comparison between the iPEP of clonal PCs from patients with AL amyloidosis vs MGUS and MM cases, was performed using the canonical-correlation analysis (CCA) tool and graphical representation of the Infinicyt software. The BM cellular composition in healthy adults, MGUS, AL amyloidosis and MM patients was compared and the distance among individual cases evaluated using the 2-dimensional minimum spanning tree (MST) force-directed classification and graphical



representation available in the Infinicyt software, based on Euclidean distances and the Boruvka algorithm.

**Statistical analyses.** Progression-free survival (PFS) was measured from time of diagnosis to hematological and/or organ progression or death from any cause; overall survival (OS) was defined as time from diagnosis to death from any cause.(20) Survival was analyzed by the Kaplan–Meier method, and differences between curves were tested for statistical significance with the (two-sided) log-rank test. A multivariate Cox proportional hazard model was developed to explore the independent effect on PFS and OS of well-known prognostic factors in AL amyloidosis: patients' age, number of organs involved, Mayo (2012) staging, the percentage of BM PCs based on cytomorphology, and treatment with autologous stem cell transplantation (ASCT).(21) Receiver Operating Curve (ROC) analysis was used to assess the accuracy of the scoring model developed with immunophenotypic parameters with significantly different prevalence in AL amyloidosis vs MGUS and MM. The  $\chi^2$  or Mann-Whitney U and the Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric tests were used to evaluate the statistical significance of differences observed between two and more groups, respectively. The SPSS software (version 20.0; IBM, Chicago, IL,) were used for all statistical analyses.

## RESULTS

**Assessment of clonality in AL amyloidosis using MFC.** Clonal PCs were detected in BM samples from 93 of the 94 (99%) patients with AL amyloidosis (median, 0.8%; range, 0% - 21%), whereas a (serum and/or urine) M-component by electrophoresis or immunofixation and an abnormal serum free-light chain ratio were detected in 80.5%, 93% and 75% of patients, respectively (Table 1). Overall, only 4 patients had undetectable M-component by any of the three methods (4%), and clonal PCs were detectable by MFC in all 4 cases (range, 0.004% - 0.22%). Morphological assessment of PC infiltration in BM aspirates of AL amyloidosis patients' (median, 8%; range, 0% - 60%), showed  $\leq 1\%$  PCs in 9% of cases,  $\leq 5\%$  in 33% of patients and 55% had  $< 10\%$  BM PCs.

The median number of PCs by MFC was 0.9% and the percentage of clonal and normal PCs within the BM PC compartment was of 93% and 7%, respectively. Firstly, we validated thresholds of total BM PCs (i.e.  $< 1\%$  vs  $\geq 1\%$ ), clonal PCs (i.e.  $< 2.5\%$  vs  $\geq 2.5\%$ ) and normal PCs within the BM PC compartment (i.e.  $\leq 5\%$  vs  $> 5\%$ ), that had been previously shown to be of prognostic value (Supplementary Figure 1).(16,17) Subsequently, we used the frequency of BM PCs plus the percentage of clonal and normal PCs within the whole BM PC compartment, to investigate the prognostic impact of MFC-based automated population separator (APS) classification, by comparing the overall distribution for the above defined three PC-associated parameters in patients with AL amyloidosis vs MGUS and newly-diagnosed MM (Figure 1A). Of the 93 patients in whom clonality by MFC was detected, 6 displayed an MM-like signature, 38 an MGUS-like signature, whereas the remaining 49 cases had a signature intermediate between the MGUS and MM reference datasets. Except for the frequency of renal involvement, patients with AL amyloidosis stratified according to this APS classification showed similar baseline clinical features (Supplementary Table 1), but significantly different survival (Figure 1B-C). Thus, patients with AL amyloidosis classified as MM-like displayed significantly higher rates of early mortality (median PFS

and OS of 1 month), whereas cases classified as MGUS-like displayed the best outcome (median PFS and OS not reached), significantly superior to that of patients with intermediate-AL amyloidosis (median of 15 and 25 months for PFS and OS, respectively). Multivariate analysis of baseline prognostic factors for survival, including the MFC-APS profile, patients' age, number of organs involved, Mayo 2012 staging, the percentage of BM PCs based on cytomorphology and eligibility for ASCT, showed that the intermediate plus MM-like profiles had an independent adverse effect on patients' PFS (hazard ratio: 2.9;  $P = .01$ ) and OS (hazard ratio: 3.0;  $P = .03$ ) (Table 2).

**iPEP of clonal PCs in AL amyloidosis vs MGUS and MM.** After establishing the utility of flow cytometry immunophenotyping to assess clonality and predict survival in AL amyloidosis, we subsequently investigated if the same combination of markers could identify phenotypic signatures associated with different outcomes. We used the percentages of surface expression for CD19, CD27, CD45, CD56, CD81 and CD117, whereas for CD38 and CD138, patients were classified into low vs bright staining according to the mean fluorescence intensity observed for these markers in clonal PCs vs other nucleated cells. Thus, t-Distributed Stochastic Neighbor Embedding (t-SNE) defined by the iPEP of clonal PCs (Supplementary Figure 2A) based on all possible combinations of markers (i.e. CD19, CD27, CD38, CD45, CD56, CD81, CD117, CD138), revealed two major patient clusters defined by opposite patterns of expression for CD45 ( $P = .02$ ), CD56 ( $P < .001$ ) and CD138 ( $P = .002$ ): cases with higher expression of CD45, CD56 and CD138 ( $CD45^{+ve}CD56^{+ve}CD138^{hi}$ ,  $N = 50$ ; coded green in Figure 2B) vs patients with lower reactivity for CD45, CD56 and CD138 ( $CD45^{-ve}CD56^{-ve}CD138^{lo}$ ,  $N = 43$ ; coded brown in Supplementary Figure 2B). Interestingly, patients with a  $CD45^{+ve}CD56^{+ve}CD138^{hi}$  iPEP displayed a significantly prolonged PFS vs cases with a  $CD45^{-ve}CD56^{-ve}CD138^{lo}$  iPEP (median PFS of 26 vs 10 months, respectively;  $P = .03$ ), as well as a trend for prolonged OS (Supplementary Figure 2C-D).

The higher frequency of AL patients without homogeneously positive CD56 expression (56 of 93 cases, 60%) when compared to other monoclonal gammopathies, led us to investigate whether flow cytometry immunophenotyping could contribute to the differential diagnosis between AL amyloidosis and MGUS/MM based on the tumor PC antigen expression profile. Interestingly, canonical-correlation analysis (CCA) of tumor iPEP showed only partial overlap between AL amyloidosis vs MGUS and MM tumor PC (Figures 2A and 2B, respectively), as patients with newly-diagnosed AL amyloidosis displayed an iPEP between MGUS and MM (Figure 2C and Supplementary Table 2). Thus, progressively higher percentages of cases with a CD38<sup>lo</sup>, CD45<sup>-ve</sup>, CD81<sup>-ve</sup> and CD138<sup>lo</sup> iPEP were observed from MGUS to AL amyloidosis and MM. By contrast, patients with AL amyloidosis displayed a significantly lower reactivity for CD56 vs both MGUS and MM (mean of 55% vs 79% CD56<sup>+ve</sup> clonal PCs in AL amyloidosis vs MGUS/MM, respectively;  $P \leq .03$ ), which explains why in both CCA projections, most MGUS and MM patients grouped together with CD56<sup>+ve</sup> AL patients (Figures 2A-B). The emergence of clear immunophenotypic differences across monoclonal gammopathies led us to further investigate other markers that could be differentially expressed in AL amyloidosis (N = 38) vs MM (N = 52). For this purpose, a comprehensive screening for another 20 markers including maturation-associated cell membrane proteins (CD10, CD20, CD21, CD24, HLADR), tetraspanins (CD9, CD53, CD63) and other adhesion molecules (CD31, CD49d), chemokine receptors (CD196, BAFF-R, CXCR4), immune regulatory receptors (CD43, CD69, CD200) and immunotherapy targets (CD74, CD229, SLAMF7, PD-L1) was performed, showing that CD20, CD43, CD53 and CD63 were significantly upregulated in BM clonal PC from AL amyloidosis vs MM patients (Supplementary Figure 3A-D). Furthermore, immune therapeutic targets such as CD38 and SLAMF7 were also significantly overexpressed in patients with AL amyloidosis; by contrast, no significant differences were noted in the mean fluorescence intensity of CD138 or PD-L1, and CD229 was significantly downregulated in patients with AL amyloidosis (Supplementary Figure 4).

## **Bone marrow cellular composition in AL amyloidosis vs MGUS and MM.**

Since some of the markers found to be differentially expressed in AL amyloidosis vs MM corresponded to immune regulatory receptors, further characterization of the BM cellular composition was performed aimed at investigating whether patients with AL amyloidosis, MGUS and MM displayed different profiles. Based on the same 8-color MoAb combination described above to assess clonality, up to 16 cell populations and 18 parameters were systematically assessed in all studied cases (Figure 3A). Subsequently, we investigated the degree of similarity and divergence across patients with AL amyloidosis, MGUS and active MM, based on a minimum spanning tree (MST) model built upon the 18 phenotypic parameters. Interestingly, the three disease categories converged into a (unique) specific node when integrated into the natural diversity of age-matched healthy adults (Figure 3B). Of note, in the MST representation, AL amyloidosis cases plotted between MGUS and MM patients, with a more detailed analysis of the BM cellular composition revealing that for 6/18 immunophenotypic parameters (i.e. erythroid hematopoietic progenitors, neutrophils, monocytes, TNK- plus NK-cells and other remaining non-T/NK T-lymphocytes, PCs) AL amyloidosis patients were closer to MGUS; for another 6/18 parameters (i.e. CD38<sup>-</sup> and CD38<sup>+</sup> hematopoietic progenitors, eosinophils, erythroblasts, naïve and memory B-lymphocytes) AL amyloidosis patients were between MGUS and MM; whereas for the remaining 6 immune parameters (i.e. myeloid progenitors, basophils, mast cells, B-cell precursors, normal and clonal PCs) (Figure 3C) AL amyloidosis patients were closer to MM. Thus, MFC-based analysis of the tumor microenvironment mapped AL amyloidosis in between MGUS and MM. Of note, while the BM cellular composition in AL amyloidosis showed progressively more differences from elderly healthy adults, MGUS and MM (4, 7 and 12 significantly different phenotypic parameters, respectively) (Figure 3D), the percentage of B-cell precursors was consistently lower in patients with AL amyloidosis than in elderly healthy adults, MGUS and MM ( $P = .004$ ; Supplementary Table 3).

**Immunophenotypic hallmarks of AL amyloidosis.** Simultaneous iPEP of tumor PCs and monitoring of the BM cellular composition unveiled that the lack of homogeneously positive CD56 expression, a reduction of B-cell precursors and a predominantly-clonal PC compartment, in the absence of an MM-like tumor PC expansion, were significantly more frequent in AL amyloidosis vs MGUS and MM. Thus, based on optimal cut-off values to discriminate between AL amyloidosis vs MGUS and MM, we built a scoring model based on the presence of <100% CD56<sup>+</sup>ve clonal PCs, <0.1% B-cell precursors, >80% clonal PCs within total BM PCs and <2% BM PCs, where each of the above 4 variables was assigned a score of 1; subsequently, patients were ranked according to their individual score. Overall, a significant ( $P < .001$ ) association was found between a progressively higher score (score range, 1 - 4) and the diagnosis of AL amyloidosis (14%, 63%, 64% and 95%, respectively) vs MGUS (25%, 10%, 8%, 5%, respectively) or MM (61%, 27%, 28%, 0%, respectively) (Table 3). Thus, a t-SNE projection based on these four phenotypic parameters displayed selective clustering of patients with AL amyloidosis vs MGUS and MM (Figure 4A), with a 74% accurate classification based on ROC analysis (AUC of 0.74; 95% CI = 0.66 - 0.82;  $P < .001$ ) of the performance of the scoring model (Figure 4B).

## DISCUSSION

Despite important advances have been achieved, diagnosis of AL amyloidosis and prognostic stratification of the disease remains a challenge in a significant fraction of patients. In recent years, flow cytometry immunophenotyping of BM PCs in AL amyloidosis had emerged as a potential complementary diagnostic tool (16,17,22–24); however, as it has occurred in MM, disturbing levels of variability on the results due to the use of highly heterogeneous and non-standardized methodological approaches, exists.(25) Here, we followed standard EuroFlow protocols to study BM samples from a large series of patients with AL amyloidosis, and developed an automated classification algorithm that identified patients with significantly different outcomes, despite showing similar organ involvement and Mayo staging. Importantly, this MFC-based automated risk classification emerged as an independent prognostic factor in AL amyloidosis, and is ready for multicentric validation and implementation in routine clinical practice.(10)

Currently, there is limited data on the potential contribution of the underlying PC clone and its features for prognostication in AL amyloidosis. In addition to the PC percentage by cytomorphology(26) and iFISH abnormalities (27,28), only the sFLC load has consistently been shown to have an impact on patient survival.(29) However, abnormal PCs in AL amyloidosis are difficult to identify by morphology due to their small number, minor morphological alterations, and co-existence with normal BM PCs.(30) In turn, the typically low tumor burden in AL amyloidosis together with the co-existence of normal PCs in the patients' BM also hamper accurate assessment of cytogenetic abnormalities by iFISH, even when conventional PC-enrichment magnetic procedures are used; thus, according to Muchtar et al in a large patient series, accurate iFISH analysis of tumor PCs in AL amyloidosis would only be possible in two-thirds of patients.(28) Most likely, the co-existence of clonal and normal PCs also accounts for those 15% cases with a normal FLC ratio, identified among almost 1,000 patients diagnosed with AL amyloidosis in Pavia (Italy) (7), and the 14% of >1,000 newly-diagnosed amyloidosis patients with dFLC<5 mg/dL reported by Sidana et al.(31)

Here, we confirm and extend on previous findings based on small patient series (6,16) and demonstrate that MFC allows fast, accurate and sensitive demonstration of clonality in virtually every patient with AL amyloidosis, including those with undetectable M-protein. In addition, we validated different phenotypic thresholds that have been previously reported to be of prognostic relevance in AL amyloidosis (16,17) and propose a new automated computerized algorithm based on simultaneous assessment of tumor burden and the degree of clonality within the BM PC compartment, that identifies three AL amyloidosis patient subgroups (i.e. MGUS-like, intermediate and MM-like) with a similar frequency of cardiac involvement and distribution for the Mayo staging system, but significantly different survival rates, pointing out the independent prognostic value of BM PC clonality vs other conventional prognostic factors, including cardiac biomarkers.(32) However, it should be noted that the present series is skewed towards more aggressive disease stages (e.g.: only 5% of patients have Mayo stage I), and further analyses in series with higher frequencies of patients with Mayo 2012 stage I are warranted to validate our results. Another limitation of this study is the relatively low number of events for PFS (n=39) or OS (n=30), and further analyses in larger series and with longer follow-up are also warranted to confirm the independent prognostic value of MFC immunophenotyping.

The availability of software tools for automated analysis of immunophenotypic NGF data generated with the EuroFlow protocols used here (10), together with the large databases for unbiased/objective patient classification (33), allows for easy implementation in diagnostic laboratories worldwide of standardized flow cytometry approaches to assess clonality and predict outcome in AL amyloidosis. Thus, this study addresses the need for consensus on how to use flow cytometry in AL amyloidosis (e.g. amount of cells, which markers, gating strategies) (11) and overcomes the usage of different arbitrary thresholds of PC clonality to risk stratify patients.(16,17) This may be particularly relevant in diseases with low tumor burden such as AL amyloidosis, in



1 which different phenotypic protocols or even hemodilution may impact on the  
2 percentage of PCs detected by flow cytometry.(6,16,17)

3 The immunophenotypic characterization of tumor PCs has shown to be of  
4 prognostic value in newly-diagnosed MM patients (34,35) but, thus far, no data has  
5 been reported in AL amyloidosis. Here, NGF was used for unbiased/objective  
6 identification of clusters of patients with AL amyloidosis based on their distinct iPEP,  
7 our results showing that cases with a CD45<sup>-ve</sup>CD56<sup>-ve</sup>CD138<sup>lo</sup> phenotype have an  
8 inferior survival. These findings differ from those recently reported in MM (35), where  
9 expression of CD45 is associated with an inferior outcome and CD56 was found to be  
10 the only marker without prognostic value.

11 Driven by these observations and the surprisingly high number of patients that  
12 showed lack of homogeneous positivity for CD56, we also explored whether flow  
13 cytometry could help distinguishing AL amyloidosis from other monoclonal  
14 gammopathies. It has been hypothesized that AL amyloidosis, MGUS and MM are the  
15 same disease entity at the cellular level, with AL amyloidosis just being a clonal PC  
16 disorder with an “unlucky protein”.(36) Thus, genetic studies performed in patients with  
17 AL amyloidosis have shown different frequencies but not different type of cytogenetic  
18 abnormalities in the former vs MM.(27,28,37–39) Genome-wide association studies  
19 have also provided evidence for common genetic susceptibility to AL amyloidosis and  
20 MM.(40) By contrast, here we demonstrate that on phenotypic grounds, AL amyloidosis  
21 is on the crossroad between MGUS and MM, particularly for markers such as CD38,  
22 CD45, CD81 and CD138. Namely, the density of CD38 (as well as other potential  
23 immunotherapy targets such as CD138 and SLAMF7) expressed on the surface of  
24 tumor PCs, was significantly higher in AL amyloidosis than in MM. These findings  
25 suggest that anti-CD38 monoclonal antibody therapy might be highly effective in AL  
26 amyloidosis, as recently reported.(41) By contrast, lack of homogenously-positive  
27 CD56 expression emerges as a hallmark of AL amyloidosis vs. both MGUS and MM. In  
28 addition, other markers such as CD20, CD43, CD53 and CD63 were also found to be

1 significantly upregulated in AL amyloidosis vs MM. While the role of the CD53 and  
2 CD63 tetraspanins remains to be determined (42), increased CD20 expression likely  
3 reflects the higher frequency of t(11;14) in AL amyloidosis vs MM (27,28,36,37,43);  
4 interestingly, CD43 appears to be important for immune function and it has been  
5 identified as an adverse prognostic factor in diffuse large B-cell lymphoma.(44,45)

6       Recently, Muchtar et al have demonstrated the prognostic value of the balance  
7 between monotypic vs polytypic PCs, and suggested that this could be partially related  
8 to an impaired immune surveillance, and thus potentially associated with a poorer  
9 patient outcome.(17) Since the enumeration of all different cell types is a standard  
10 procedure in flow cytometry diagnostics of hematological samples, herein we took full  
11 advantage of the multidimensionality of flow cytometry as well as the expression in  
12 other BM cells of those markers used to assess PC clonality, to unravel the tumor  
13 microenvironment in AL amyloidosis vs MGUS and MM. In line with our observations  
14 based on the iPEP of clonal PCs, profiling of the BM cellular composition also mapped  
15 AL amyloidosis in the crossroad between MGUS and MM. Thus, patients with AL  
16 amyloidosis displayed a clonal/polyclonal PC distribution similar to MM, but with overall  
17 BM PC infiltration levels closer to those of MGUS patients. Most importantly, patients  
18 with AL amyloidosis showed a marked reduction of B-cell precursors when compared  
19 to age-matched healthy adults, MGUS and MM patients; thus, the combination of these  
20 four BM features emerged as a hallmark of AL amyloidosis. Interestingly, patients with  
21 AL amyloidosis and MM displayed significantly further reduction of B-cell precursors  
22 when compared to the rest of AL cases (0.001% vs 0.05%, respectively;  $P < .001$ ).

23       Disease recognition and early diagnosis are key steps to improve outcome in  
24 AL amyloidosis, a disease in which early mortality remains high, particularly in  
25 transplant-ineligible patients.(46) Here we demonstrate the value of MFC for fast  
26 diagnostic screening of BM PC clonality in AL amyloidosis and simultaneous  
27 automated patient risk-stratification, based on the BM tumor burden and PC  
28 phenotype. In addition, our results also provide new immunophenotypic markers (i.e.

1 lack homogenously-positive CD56 expression, reduced numbers of BM B-cell  
2 precursors, a predominantly-clonal PC compartment in the absence of a significant  
3 tumor PC expansion in the BM) for the identification of patients with monoclonal  
4 gammopathies that are candidates for monitoring of pre-symptomatic organ damage  
5 related to AL amyloidosis.

6

7

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was supported by the Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red – Área de Oncología - del Instituto de Salud Carlos III (CIBERONC; CB16/12/00369, CB16/12/00400 and CB16/12/00489), Instituto de Salud Carlos III/Subdirección General de Investigación Sanitaria (FIS No. PI13/02196), Asociación Española Contra el Cáncer (GCB120981SAN and Accelerator Award), the Black Swan Research Initiative of the International Myeloma Foundation, and the European Research Council (ERC) 2015 Starting Grant (MYELOMANEXT).

We thank all the investigators that included patients in this study: Abelardo Barez, Albert Oriol, Albert Perez, Alfonso Garcia De Coca, Amaia Balerdi, Angel Ramirez, Cristina Martinez, Daniel Borrego, Elena Cabezudo, Elham Askari, Enrique Ocio, Esther Gonzalez , Felipe Arriba, Felipe Prosper, Gonzalo Caballero, Isabel Krsnik, Javier de la Rubia, Javier Marco, Jesus San Miguel, Joaquin Martinez-Lopez, Jorge Labrador, Jose Enrique De La Puerta, Jose Julio Hernandez, Jose Luis Sastre, Jose Maria Alonso, Juan Jose Bargay, Juan Jose Gavira, Juan Jose Lahuerta ,Luis Palomera , Maria Casanova, Maria Dolores Garcia-Malo, Maria Jesus Blanchard, Maria Jose Cejalvo, Maria Lourdes EliceGUI, Maria Sarasa, Maria Victoria Mateos, Martin Mascaró, Martin Nuñez, Mercedes Berenguer, Mercedes Gironella, Noemi Puig, Norma Gutiérrez, Perla Salama Bendayan , Rafael Del Orbe ,Rafael Ríos, Ramon Garcia-Sanz ,Ramon Lecumberri, Rebeca Cuello, Roberto Hernandez, Rosa Lopez, Valentin Cabañas, Vicente Carrasco , and Tomas Gonzalez.

## COMPETING INTERESTS

All authors declared no conflicts of interest.

## REFERENCES

1. Merlini G. AL amyloidosis: from molecular mechanisms to targeted therapies. *Hematol Am Soc Hematol Educ Progr.* 2017 Dec;2017(1):1–12.
2. Merlini G, Stone MJ. Dangerous small B-cell clones. *Blood.* 2006 Oct;108(8):2520–30.
3. Merlini G, Palladini G. Light chain amyloidosis: the heart of the problem. Vol. 98, *Haematologica.* Italy; 2013. p. 1492–5.
4. Merlini G, Wechalekar AD, Palladini G. Systemic light chain amyloidosis: an update for treating physicians. *Blood.* 2013 Jun;121(26):5124–30.
5. Merlini G, Palladini G. Differential diagnosis of monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance. *Hematol Am Soc Hematol Educ Progr.* 2012;2012:595–603.
6. Paiva B, Martinez-Lopez J, Corchete LA, Sanchez-Vega B, Rapado I, Puig N, et al. Phenotypic, transcriptomic, and genomic features of clonal plasma cells in light-chain amyloidosis. *Blood.* 2016;127(24):3035–9.
7. Milani P, Valentini V, Ferraro G, Basset M, Russo F, Foli A, et al. A patient with AL amyloidosis with negative free light chain results. *Clin Chem Lab Med.* 2016 Jun;54(6):1035–7.
8. Milani P, Murray DL, Barnidge DR, Kohlhagen MC, Mills JR, Merlini G, et al. The utility of MASS-FIX to detect and monitor monoclonal proteins in the clinic. *Am J Hematol.* 2017 Aug;92(8):772–9.
9. Kourelis T V, Dasari S, Theis JD, Ramirez-Alvarado M, Kurtin PJ, Gertz MA, et al. Clarifying immunoglobulin gene usage in systemic and localized immunoglobulin light-chain amyloidosis by mass spectrometry. *Blood.* 2017 Jan;129(3):299–306.
10. Flores-Montero J, Flores LS, Paiva B, Puig N, Garcia-Sanchez O, Bottcher S, et al. Next generation flow (NGF) for highly sensitive and standardized detection of minimal residual disease in multiple myeloma. *Leukemia.* 2017;

11. Schonland S, Hegenbart U. Flow in a fibril-forming disease. *Blood*. 2017 Jan;129(1):7–8.
12. Paiva B, Montes MC, Garcia-Sanz R, Ocio EM, Alonso J, de Las Heras N, et al. Multiparameter flow cytometry for the identification of the Waldenstrom's clone in IgM-MGUS and Waldenstrom's Macroglobulinemia: new criteria for differential diagnosis and risk stratification. *Leukemia*. 2014;28(1):166–73.
13. Paiva B, Chandia M, Vidriales MB, Colado E, Caballero-Velazquez T, Escalante F, et al. Multiparameter flow cytometry for staging of solitary bone plasmacytoma: new criteria for risk of progression to myeloma. *Blood* [Internet]. 2014;124(8):1300–3. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24876564>
14. Paiva B, Vidriales MB, Mateo G, Perez JJ, Montalban MA, Sureda A, et al. The persistence of immunophenotypically normal residual bone marrow plasma cells at diagnosis identifies a good prognostic subgroup of symptomatic multiple myeloma patients. *Blood*. 2009;114(20):4369–72.
15. Paiva B, Vidriales MB, Rosinol L, Martinez-Lopez J, Mateos M V, Ocio EM, et al. A multiparameter flow cytometry immunophenotypic algorithm for the identification of newly diagnosed symptomatic myeloma with an MGUS-like signature and long-term disease control. *Leukemia* [Internet]. 2013;27(10):2056–61. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23743858>
16. Paiva B, Vidriales MB, Perez JJ, Lopez-Berges MC, Garcia-Sanz R, Ocio EM, et al. The clinical utility and prognostic value of multiparameter flow cytometry immunophenotyping in light-chain amyloidosis. *Blood*. 2011;117(13):3613–6.
17. Muchtar E, Jevremovic D, Dispenzieri A, Dingli D, Buadi FK, Lacy MQ, et al. The prognostic value of multiparametric flow cytometry in AL amyloidosis at diagnosis and at the end of first-line treatment. *Blood*. 2017 Jan;129(1):82–7.
18. Gertz MA, Comenzo R, Falk RH, Fermand JP, Hazenberg BP, Hawkins PN, et al. Definition of organ involvement and treatment response in immunoglobulin

light chain amyloidosis (AL): a consensus opinion from the 10th International Symposium on Amyloid and Amyloidosis, Tours, France, 18-22 April 2004. *Am J Hematol*. 2005 Aug;79(4):319–28.

19. Gillmore JD, Wechalekar A, Bird J, Cavenagh J, Hawkins S, Kazmi M, et al. Guidelines on the diagnosis and investigation of AL amyloidosis. *Br J Haematol*. 2015 Jan;168(2):207–18.

20. Comenzo RL, Reece D, Palladini G, Seldin D, Santhorawala V, Landau H, et al. Consensus guidelines for the conduct and reporting of clinical trials in systemic light-chain amyloidosis. *Leukemia*. 2012 Nov;26(11):2317–25.

21. Dispenzieri A, Gertz MA, Kyle RA, Lacy MQ, Burritt MF, Therneau TM, et al. Serum cardiac troponins and N-terminal pro-brain natriuretic peptide: a staging system for primary systemic amyloidosis. *J Clin Oncol*. 2004 Sep;22(18):3751–7.

22. Sidana S, Tandon N, Dispenzieri A, Gertz MA, Dingli D, Jevremovic D, et al. Prognostic significance of circulating plasma cells by multi-parametric flow cytometry in light chain amyloidosis. *Leukemia*. 2018 Feb;

23. Lee H, Duggan P, Neri P, Tay J, Bahlis NJ, Jimenez-Zepeda VH. Minimal residual disease (MRD) assessment by flow cytometry after ASCT for AL amyloidosis: are we there yet? *Bone Marrow Transplant*. 2017 Jun;52(6):915–7.

24. Lisenko K, Schonland SO, Jauch A, Andrusis M, Rocken C, Ho AD, et al. Flow cytometry-based characterization of underlying clonal B and plasma cells in patients with light chain amyloidosis. *Cancer Med*. 2016 Jul;5(7):1464–72.

25. Flanders A, Stetler-Stevenson M, Landgren O. Minimal residual disease testing in multiple myeloma by flow cytometry: major heterogeneity. *Blood* [Internet]. 2013;122(6):1088–9. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23929839>

26. Tovar N, Rodriguez-Lobato LG, Cibeira MT, Magnano L, Isola I, Rosinol L, et al. Bone marrow plasma cell infiltration in light chain amyloidosis: impact on organ involvement and outcome. *Amyloid Int J Exp Clin Investig Off J Int Soc*

Amyloidosis. 2018 Feb;1–7.

27. Bochtler T, Hegenbart U, Kunz C, Granzow M, Benner A, Seckinger A, et al. Translocation t(11;14) is associated with adverse outcome in patients with newly diagnosed AL amyloidosis when treated with bortezomib-based regimens. *J Clin Oncol*. 2015;33(12):1371–8.
28. Muchtar E, Dispenzieri A, Kumar SK, Ketterling RP, Dingli D, Lacy MQ, et al. Interphase fluorescence in situ hybridization in untreated AL amyloidosis has an independent prognostic impact by abnormality type and treatment category. *Leukemia*. 2017 Jul;31(7):1562–9.
29. Kumar S, Dispenzieri A, Lacy MQ, Hayman SR, Buadi FK, Colby C, et al. Revised prognostic staging system for light chain amyloidosis incorporating cardiac biomarkers and serum free light chain measurements. *J Clin Oncol*. 2012;30(9):989–95.
30. Filipova J, Rihova L, Vsianska P, Kufova Z, Kryukova E, Kryukov F, et al. Flow cytometry in immunoglobulin light chain amyloidosis: Short review. *Leuk Res*. 2015 Jul;
31. Sidana S, Tandon N, Dispenzieri A, Gertz MA, Buadi FK, Lacy MQ, et al. Clinical presentation and outcomes in light chain amyloidosis patients with non-evaluable serum free light chains. *Leukemia*. 2017 Sep;
32. Milani P, Basset M, Russo F, Foli A, Merlini G, Palladini G. Patients with light-chain amyloidosis and low free light-chain burden have distinct clinical features and outcome. *Blood*. 2017 Aug;130(5):625–31.
33. Lhermitte L, Mejstrikova E, van der Sluijs-Gelling AJ, Grigore GE, Sedek L, Bras AE, et al. Automated database-guided expert-supervised orientation for immunophenotypic diagnosis and classification of acute leukemia. *Leukemia*. 2017 Nov;
34. Mateo G, Montalban MA, Vidriales MB, Lahuerta JJ, Mateos M V, Gutierrez N, et al. Prognostic value of immunophenotyping in multiple myeloma: a study by the



- PETHEMA/GEM cooperative study groups on patients uniformly treated with high-dose therapy. *J Clin Oncol.* 2008;26(16):2737–44.
35. Arana P, Paiva B, Cedena M-T, Puig N, Cordon L, Vidriales M-B, et al. Prognostic value of antigen expression in multiple myeloma: A PETHEMA/GEM study on 1,265 patients enrolled in four consecutive clinical trials. *Leukemia.* 2017 Nov;
36. Hayman SR, Bailey RJ, Jalal SM, Ahmann GJ, Dispenzieri A, Gertz MA, et al. Translocations involving the immunoglobulin heavy-chain locus are possible early genetic events in patients with primary systemic amyloidosis. *Blood.* 2001;98(7):2266–8.
37. Bryce AH, Ketterling RP, Gertz MA, Lacy M, Knudson RA, Zeldenrust S, et al. Translocation t(11;14) and survival of patients with light chain (AL) amyloidosis. *Haematologica.* 2009;94(3):380–6.
38. Bochtler T, Hegenbart U, Heiss C, Benner A, Moos M, Seckinger A, et al. Hyperdiploidy is less frequent in AL amyloidosis compared with monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance and inversely associated with translocation t(11;14). *Blood.* 2011;117(14):3809–15.
39. Bochtler T, Hegenbart U, Kunz C, Benner A, Seckinger A, Dietrich S, et al. Gain of chromosome 1q21 is an independent adverse prognostic factor in light chain amyloidosis patients treated with melphalan/dexamethasone. *Amyloid.* 2014;21(1):9–17.
40. da Silva Filho MI, Forsti A, Weinhold N, Mezziane I, Campo C, Huhn S, et al. Genome-wide association study of immunoglobulin light chain amyloidosis in three patient cohorts: comparison with myeloma. *Leukemia.* 2017 Aug;31(8):1735–42.
41. Kaufman GP, Schrier SL, Lafayette RA, Arai S, Witteles RM, Liedtke M. Daratumumab yields rapid and deep hematologic responses in patients with heavily pretreated AL amyloidosis. *Blood.* 2017 Aug;130(7):900–2.

- 1 42. Barrena S, Almeida J, Yunta M, Lopez A, Fernandez-Mosteirin N, Giralto M, et al.  
2 Aberrant expression of tetraspanin molecules in B-cell chronic  
3 lymphoproliferative disorders and its correlation with normal B-cell maturation.  
4 Leukemia. 2005;19(8):1376–83.
- 5 43. Harrison CJ, Mazzullo H, Ross FM, Cheung KL, Gerrard G, Harewood L, et al.  
6 Translocations of 14q32 and deletions of 13q14 are common chromosomal  
7 abnormalities in systemic amyloidosis. Br J Haematol. 2002;117(2):427–35.
- 8 44. Mitrovic Z, Ilic I, Nola M, Aurer I, Sonicki Z, Basic-Kinda S, et al. CD43  
9 expression is an adverse prognostic factor in diffuse large B-Cell lymphoma. Clin  
10 Lymphoma Myeloma. 2009 Apr;9(2):133–7.
- 11 45. Mitrovic Z, Iqbal J, Fu K, Smith LM, Bast M, Greiner TC, et al. CD43 expression  
12 is associated with inferior survival in the non-germinal centre B-cell subgroup of  
13 diffuse large B-cell lymphoma. Br J Haematol. 2013 Jul;162(1):87–92.
- 14 46. Muchtar E, Gertz MA, Kumar SK, Lacy MQ, Dingli D, Buadi FK, et al. Improved  
15 outcomes for newly diagnosed AL amyloidosis between 2000 and 2014:  
16 cracking the glass ceiling of early death. Blood. 2017 Apr;129(15):2111–9.

**Figure legends.**

**Figure 1. Outcome of patients with newly-diagnosed AL amyloidosis classified according to the automated population separator (APS) immunophenotypic profile of BM clonal PCs. (A)** Patients plotted in the overlapping area between monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS) and newly-diagnosed multiple myeloma (MM) (N = 49, 53%), were classified as intermediate AL amyloidosis cases; otherwise they were classified as MGUS-like (N = 38, 41%), or assigned to the MM reference group (N = 6, 6%); this classification showed significantly different progression-free (PFS) **(B)** and overall survival (OS) **(C)** for the above three AL amyloidosis patient subgroups.

**Figure 2. Immunophenotypic protein expression profile (iPEP) of monoclonal gammopathies.** In the canonical-correlation analysis (CCA) graphical view, every patient is represented by a single dot and disease reference groups by 1 (dashed lines) and 2 (solid lines) standard deviation curves. **(A)** and **(B)** display CCA between subjects with monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS, in green; N = 20) vs patients with newly-diagnosed light-chain amyloidosis (AL, in blue; N = 93) and between the later vs patients with newly-diagnosed multiple myeloma (MM, in red; N = 52), respectively. **(C)** Graphical representation of the expression of markers used for assessment of PC clonality in subjects with MGUS vs patients with AL and MM (described in detail in Supplementary Table 2). The dynamics of expression from MGUS to MM are depicted by the geometric shape graded from green (MGUS) to red (MM), whereas the relative proximity (determined by comparing the median values of antigen expression described in Supplementary Table 2) of AL amyloidosis to MGUS or MM is depicted by the blue bar: the closer to MGUS the closer to the left; the closer to MM the closer to the right. The vertical black bar represents the mean value (half-distance) between MGUS and MM for each marker. Markers with statistically significant differences are underlined.

**Figure 3. Landscape of the bone marrow cellular composition in elderly healthy adults and patients with monoclonal gammopathies.** **(A)** Illustrative automated population separator (APS) plot based on principal component analysis of the tumor microenvironment of a patient with newly-diagnosed light-chain amyloidosis (AL). **(B)** 2-dimensional minimum spanning tree (MST) plot defined by the distribution of 18 phenotype-based cell parameters in the bone marrow (BM) of elderly healthy adults (HA, N = 29; each represented by a single grey dot) and subjects with monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS, N = 20), patients with newly-diagnosed AL amyloidosis (N = 93) and active multiple myeloma (MM, N = 52) (grouped into blue, green and red clusters, respectively). **(C)** Graphical representation of the similitude of each cell population in AL amyloidosis vs. MGUS or MM. The vertical bar represents the mean value (half-distance) between MGUS and MM for each cell population. **(D)** Bone marrow cell populations decreased or increased (statistical significance is depicted by grades of blue and red, respectively) in patients with newly-diagnosed AL amyloidosis vs HA, MGUS and MM (described in detail in Supplementary Table 3). We used the Mann–Whitney U test to evaluate the statistical significance of differences observed between AL amyloidosis vs each of the other three groups. Overall, MFC-based analysis of the BM cellular composition mapped AL amyloidosis in between MGUS and MM; for example, when compared to MGUS, patients with AL amyloidosis showed significantly higher percentages of CD38<sup>-ve</sup> and CD38<sup>+ve</sup> CD117<sup>+ve</sup> hematopoietic progenitors as well as higher total and clonal PC numbers, whereas the opposite pattern was found when patients with AL amyloidosis were compared to MM cases. Conversely, the percentage of normal PCs was significantly decreased in AL amyloidosis vs MGUS but increased when compared to MM.

**Figure 4. Differential diagnosis between AL amyloidosis vs MGUS and MM based on phenotypic parameters.** **(A)** t-Distributed Stochastic Neighbor Embedding (t-SNE)

1 projection of patients with AL amyloidosis (N = 93), MGUS (N = 20) and MM (N = 52)  
2 represented by blue, green and red circles, respectively, based on the percentage of  
3 CD56<sup>+ve</sup> clonal plasma cells (PC)s, B-cell precursors, clonal PCs within total bone  
4 marrow (BM) PCs, as well as PCs from all nucleated BM cells. **(B)** Receiver operating  
5 characteristic (ROC) curve generated using the scoring model described in Table 3.  
6

**Table 1.** Demographics, clinical-biological characteristics and PC clonality status at baseline in newly-diagnosed patients with AL amyloidosis (N = 94).

Patient feature	Distribution
Age (years)*	67 (41 – 86)
% of males	61%
N. of organs involved*	2 (1 – 4)
Cardiac involvement (%)	53%
Renal involvement (%)	52%
Peripheral neuropathy (%)	11%
Liver involvement (%)	14%
Gastrointestinal involvement (%)	24%
2012 Mayo stage (%)	
I	5%
II	33%
III	26%
IV	36%
Isotype (%)	
Free Kappa	10%
Free Lambda	31%
IgG-Kappa	12%
IgG-Lambda	35%
IgA-Kappa	1%
IgA-Lambda	11%
M-component by protein electrophoresis (%)	80.5%
M-component by immunofixation (%)	93%
Abnormal serum free light-chain ratio (%)	75%
dFLC (mg/L)*	171 (0.2 - 18891)
% PCs in BM aspirates by morphology*	8 (0 – 60)
Clonality by multidimensional flow cytometry, (%)	99%
First-line treatment (%)	
ASCT	15%
Bortezomib-based	56%
Melphalan-based	14%
Immunomodulatory drugs-based	1%
No treatment	4%
Unknown	10%

Results expressed as percentage of cases or as \*median (range). PCs: plasma cells; dFLC: difference between the involved and uninvolved serum free-light chains; ASCT: autologous stem cell transplantation

**Table 2.** Multivariate analyses of prognostic factors for progression-free survival (PFS) and overall survival (OS) in AL amyloidosis patients.

	PFS		OS	
	HR (95% CI)	<i>P</i>	HR (95% CI)	<i>P</i>
<b>2012 Mayo stage IV</b>	2.9 (1.4 – 6.0)	.005	3.1 (1.3 – 7.4)	.009
<b>≥20% PCs by morphology</b>	1.5 (0.5 – 4.4)	.48	2.3 (0.8 – 7.3)	.14
<b>Intermediate- or MM-like APS profiles</b>	2.9 (1.3 - 6.6)	.01	3.0 (1.1 - 8.4)	.03

PCs: plasma cells; APS: automated population separator; MM: multiple myeloma

**Table 3.** Scoring model to predict for the diagnosis of AL amyloidosis vs monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS) and multiple myeloma (MM), based on the following phenotypic parameters (each assigned a score value of 1): <100% CD56<sup>+ve</sup> clonal PCs, <0.1% B-cell precursors, <2% BM PCs and >80% clonal PCs within all BM PCs. Patients were ranked according to the overall score for the four phenotypic parameters detected by multidimensional flow cytometry.

<b>Score (N. of patients)</b>	<b>AL amyloidosis (N = 93)</b>	<b>MGUS (N = 20)</b>	<b>MM (N = 52)</b>
1 (N = 36)	5 (14%)	9 (25%)	22 (61%)
2 (N = 49)	31 (63%)	5 (10%)	13 (27%)
3 (N = 60)	38 (64%)	5 (8%)	17 (28%)
4 (N = 20)	19 (95%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)

7